

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

H. E. DANA

5321

220.1
D. 92

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

*A Brief Story of the Problems
of Biblical Criticism*

BY

H. E. DANA

PROFESSOR OF GREEK NEW TESTAMENT IN THE SOUTH-
WESTERN BAPTIST THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY



NEW

YORK

GEORGE H. DORAN COMPANY



COPYRIGHT, 1923,
BY THE SUNDAY SCHOOL BOARD
OF THE SOUTHERN BAPTIST CONVENTION

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES. II

PRINTED IN THE UNITED STATES OF AMERICA



TO
MY WIFE

WHOSE PATIENT SACRIFICE HAS MADE POSSIBLE MY ATTAINMENT TO A SMALL MEASURE OF KNOWLEDGE OF THE GREAT BOOK, AND WHOSE SIMPLE FAITH HAS BEEN AN INSPIRATION, THIS BOOK IS
LOVINGLY DEDICATED

INTRODUCTION

BY L. R. SCARBOROUGH

I have carefully reviewed in manuscript this volume—*The Authenticity of the Holy Scriptures*—by Dr. H. E. Dana of the Southwestern Seminary, with great pleasure and profit. It is not an exhaustive treatment, and could not be, within the limits of this volume. It shows careful preparation and incisive thinking; its style is interesting and smooth; its arguments are logical; and it is true to the fundamentals of evangelical faith. It is really a charming discussion of a subject which is most vital and important at this time. It is clear in its statements: you have no trouble in knowing what the author says.

I regard this volume as of great importance. It is on a subject requiring scholarly analysis and wide investigation; but the author has presented his arguments in popular form. It strengthens one's faith in the Book of Books, and gives a hopeful view of the relation between religion and science. It is conservative. There is not a stain of radicalism or modernism in it. It is a sane presentation of the orthodox position on this great subject. There are no extravagances in it:

the argument goes down a plain path, carrying conviction as it goes.

Christ and the Bible are greatly honoured in this presentation. The reader will gain great profit from it. It stimulates faith and carries tremendous weight of conviction. I joy in the growing strength of this young scholar and author, and commend this volume to a wide reading and a careful study.

Seminary Hill, Texas.

PREFACE

In submitting this little book to the reading public the author has two purposes in view. In the first place, it is his desire that it may quicken the interest of the reader in the more important problems of Biblical criticism and enable him to survey these problems in a single comprehensive view. It is furthermore hoped that the discussion may prove a stay to the wavering faith of some one whose soul is besieged with doubt. If even in a small degree either of these objects is achieved, the author shall be more than repaid for the time and effort he has invested.

The work has been compiled from three papers, prepared for different occasions, but composed of kindred material. The chief basis of the discussion is the manuscript of an address on the subject used here as a title, delivered before the Baptist Pastors' and Laymen's Conference of Texas, in November, 1921. This address, revised and enlarged, was later published in the *Southwestern Journal of Theology*. The second paper which we have incorporated was an address on "The Problem of the Scientific Method in Bible Study," delivered before the Baptist Student Union of Texas, in October, 1922. The third paper used

was one on "The Necessity for a Revelation," prepared for submission to the American Association of Biblical Research in Dubuque, Iowa, in the summer of 1922. The favourable reception accorded these separate efforts has encouraged the author to present them in combined and permanent form. This purpose was confirmed by the offer of Dr. L. R. Scarborough, President of the Southwestern Seminary, to write an introduction for the work, for which kindness the author here records his most hearty thanks. We would not omit also to express our thanks to Prof. W. T. Conner, Editor of the *Southwestern Journal of Theology*, for the privilege of using the article previously published in that periodical.

This little book is sent forth with the hope that it may accomplish a real mission for the glory of Christ and the blessing of His people.

H. E. DANA.

Seminary Hill, Texas.

CONTENTS

	PAGE
INTRODUCTION	vii
PREFACE	ix
I THE PROBLEM STATED	15
I: THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROBLEM	17
II: THE ISSUES INVOLVED	19
II THE BIBLE AND HISTORY	26
I: THE OLD TESTAMENT	26
II: THE NEW TESTAMENT	45
III THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE	51
I: THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD AS APPLIED TO BIBLE STUDY	52
II: THE BIBLE AND NATURAL SCIENCE	62
III: THE BIBLE AND LITERARY SCIENCE	73
IV THE BIBLE AND EXPERIENCE	77

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE
HOLY SCRIPTURES

THE AUTHENTICITY OF THE HOLY SCRIPTURES

I

THE PROBLEM STATED

By the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures we mean their validity as viewed in the light of their historical origin. The problem is therefore historical and must be settled on the basis of substantial historical considerations. As a matter of fact, the only adequate and permanent solution to be found for the problems of Christianity and the Bible must be secured by a sympathetic and unprejudiced application of the historical method. The dogmatising of an overzealous orthodoxy may win the sanction and applause of the masses, but it fails utterly to satisfy the mind of the real thinker. And it is this thinker with whom future generations must reckon. He is the one who determines the progress of human thought. After the eloquent voice of the popular dogmatist has been stilled and forgotten for many decades, the influence of the cool, calculating, thoughtful investigator is just beginning to reap its greatest harvest. As we who love the old Book face the

acute criticism of the twentieth century, we fail utterly to comprehend the situation, if we expect to preserve the truth by a mere wholesale condemnation of the questions which are raised. The absolute validity of true science no one can dare to question, and whenever science calls us back to a new investigation of the rational grounds of our faith we surrender our cause and beg the whole question if we decline to respond. We must meet a scientific approach with a scientific response.

In many quarters of evangelical orthodoxy we meet a summary denial of the necessity of any effort at the defence of the authenticity of the Scriptures. With confident assurance they declare that the Bible is able to take care of itself. There appears to them no justifiable reason for raising a voice of protest against the assaults of criticism. They say we may leave it to God to defend His truth. By this attitude we are forcibly reminded of a certain well-known incident in missionary history, when a great English preacher severely rebuked a young missionary enthusiast with the words, "Sit down, young man! When God gets ready to save the heathen He will save them without your help." Identically the same principle is involved. Just as God will save the heathen only through voluntary instrumentality, so He is depending at this hour upon the heroic loyalty of His people to defend His word and truth against the onslaughts of materialistic infidelity. And if His people who love His word

allow the complacency of a mistaken optimism to delude them with reference to the immense crisis which is this day upon us, the Bible is lost to humanity. God will defend His truth; but He will defend it through human instrumentality. It behooves us, who love His truth, looking to Him for wisdom and strength, to address ourselves seriously to the problem of Biblical authenticity.

I: THE ELEMENTS OF THE PROBLEM

With reference to the historical origin of the Scriptures two matters present themselves for investigation. First, their genuineness as to authorship; and second, their credibility as to motive. These two matters constitute the elements of the problem of Biblical authenticity.

(1) The genuineness of the Scriptures as to authorship. The question of the particular identity of the author is here a matter of but little concern, except when the name of the author is a part of the sacred text. The question of supreme importance is his character. The mighty influence of the Bible over the religious consciousness of Christianity is largely based upon the belief that its various books were produced by great religious leaders, of sincere, devout, and holy character, living in close and constant fellowship with God. Any other conception of their character would be wholly out of harmony with the idea of divine inspiration. It would be exceedingly difficult to

conceive of a man as a medium of divine inspiration who had forged to a document the name of a traditional hero as a means of foisting upon the people some pet scheme or theory of his own. Of course the objection is raised that in the day in which the books of the Bible were produced the matter of such literary forgery was not nearly such a breach of the current ethical ideals as it is to-day. The truth of this statement cannot be denied, but still we can but raise the question whether such a procedure comports with the highest ethical conception of God. Would God employ such a method as a medium of revelation? We would at least wish to establish our Bible on more substantial grounds.

(2) The credibility of the Scriptures as to motive. Why was a particular book written? Christian consciousness receives it as the sincere expression of a heart on fire with a message from God. We regard our Scriptures as designed to fulfil holy purposes, in keeping with the transcendent ideals of deity. It would be a serious shock to the sensitiveness of the Christian soul to discover that a book long cherished as sacred and divine was really produced with a purely human and selfish desire to advance a process of sectarian propaganda, or to defend some favourite policy which is demonstrably of human invention. We want to believe that our Scriptures arose from impulses far more deserving of respect than that. The instinctive Christian claim for the

Bible is that it was written by holy men and for holy purposes. Is such a claim justifiable in the light of all the evidences? Such is the problem of Biblical authenticity.

II: THE ISSUES INVOLVED

What have we accomplished when we have vindicated the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures? Are the issues at stake of sufficient moment to justify the effort? These questions broach the consideration of the part which the Bible performs in the progress, happiness, and well-being of mankind. We inquire here into the contact of the Scriptures with the great practical problems of human life, and the splendid idealism of human aspirations. When we have established the validity of our claims for the Bible, what practical results have we secured?

(1) We have provided human life with an authoritative moral standard. Man is a moral being, and there is no fact of which he is more keenly conscious. In every age of his history and every state of his development he has demonstrated his sense of moral responsibility. And there is in him an instinctive craving to discharge this responsibility. Never does a human being sink so low into the degrading depths of sin that there is not a tug at his heart for a higher and better life. In his quieter moments, when he is cut off from the fascinating glamour of sin and

isolated from the frantic rush and din of a busy world, when he stands face to face with the wonderful, awe-inspiring fact of a personal self, when the influence of a reflective mood causes him to contemplate the solemn and mysterious reality of experience, then it is that the thought of the intense seriousness of life drifts into the horizon of his moral consciousness and grips his soul with the startling sense of moral responsibility. Somewhere, somehow, away in the depths of his being, an irresistible voice is declaring him accountable for the way in which he is living. In the midst of these moral reactions the highest tendencies of his nature gain for a moment the ascendancy and fill his heart with a yearning for a nobler and purer life. There seizes his soul a mighty impulse to be a truly good man. But he is confronted and overwhelmed with the question of what constitutes true goodness and how it may be attained. How shall he know the basis and limits of his moral responsibility, and how shall he meet the demands of his moral nature? To these questions the Bible offers the only adequate answer.

(2) This problem involves the substantial reality of religion. The fact of religion in human history is a phenomenon which science has not been able to ignore. It must be acknowledged and accounted for. The evolutionary scientist of the present day has proposed an explanation. He regards religion as having arisen from two elements of man's primeval experience, ignorance

and fear. His ignorance of the origin or significance of certain phenomena made him to fear, and his fear led him to posit for the phenomena supernatural causes, such as spirits and demons. Then the idea developed of certain spirits having power over others, and finally the belief in one supreme spirit. From the notion of this single supreme spirit came the idea of God. Such is the evolutionary explanation of religion.

The logical antithesis of this theory is the idea of a revealed religion. If religion did not come as a natural development, then it came by special revelation; and the reverse proposition is just as true, if religion is not the result of revelation it has come by natural development. And no one could successfully controvert the statement—indeed few would dare to challenge it—that if a personal God has revealed Himself to men the Bible is the record of that revelation. No other piece of religious literature in all the world can compare with it in its claim for that high place. Then if our Bible is not valid and dependable we have but one alternative for the explanation of religion, and that is the theory proposed by the evolutionist. But it is perfectly obvious that according to this theory religion is merely the vain assumption of a primitive mind, and has no basis beyond the vagaries of human imagination. Such a religion has little to recommend it to a thinking mind. But it is all we have left if we give up the Bible.

(3) In maintaining the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures we secure a source of rich and ennobling experience. Nothing else has ever inspired the souls of men to such heights of love and sacrifice as have the teachings of this Book. From it man has derived the holiest sentiments which have ever stirred within his breast. The highest moments of rapture which the human heart can ever know come from impulses which are stimulated by the pages of that Holy Book.

But those experiences are conditioned upon a single fact, and that fact is faith. Destroy man's confidence in the truth of the Bible as a revelation from God and you stifle every religious emotion which its pages have inspired. The best in man can never be stirred by a conscious delusion. If the pages of the Bible represent the product of an honest, but misguided religious fancy, or the fabrication of a religious enthusiasm, it contains but a very slight appeal to the holier emotions of the soul. When men cease to believe in the Bible they will cease to weep over its pages, to strive toward its ideals, to hail with blazing fervour its message, and to die in serene reliance upon its promises. Destroy the faith of humanity in the Bible and you have dried up the fountain-head of the highest and holiest experiences which the soul of man has ever known. Demolish the validity of the Holy Scriptures and you have impoverished the human race to the point of abject desperation. The hand that is laid in violence upon that Book

may expect the shock of the mightiest protest which human devotion has ever raised. To thousands of humble and noble souls the Bible means all in life worth living for, and gladly will they lay life itself upon the altar before they will surrender their faith in that Holy Book.

(4) Finally, and most important of all, in defending the Bible we are conserving for the world its only hope of redemption. There is something radically wrong with man. No fact in the universe is more clearly obvious. His history is but the record of endless war and turmoil, and his life is a perpetual rehearsal of tragedy and crime. Organised society has tried every possible recourse to curb the ravages of his perverse nature, but nothing has succeeded. We have tried punishment. We have built our jails and penitentiaries and courts of law, but man has defied the whole penal system and gone on in his sin. We have tried sympathy. We have built our hospitals and poor houses and various eleemosynary institutions, but man has imposed upon our charity and gone on in his sin. We have tried education, but instead of producing the saint which we proposed we have only refined the character of his sin. All these human institutions have their place, and perform their necessary function, but they are not sufficient, singly or combined, to solve the problem of sin. In the words of Jeremiah we cry, "Is there no balm in Gilead?" A half-drunken outcast lifted his face in the feeble glow of a dimly

lighted street and met the inquiring word and pitying gaze of a city missionary with the pathetic appeal, "O God, for somebody to help me live a better life!" These sad words voice the deepest need of the human race. The world needs somebody to help it up to a better life. The only one who can do that for the world is Jesus. His nail-scarred hand alone has the power to raise human life from the midnight gloom of depravity. But Jesus' redemptive work must stand or fall with the Bible. So completely is the significance of His personality and ministry identified with the Christian Scriptures that to destroy the faith of humanity in those Scriptures would be to forever annul the appeal of Jesus. Therefore, the problem before us contains the highest interest of human life: man's hope of purity and eternal redemption.

We have before us now in brief outline something of the problem of Biblical authenticity. The limits to which this discussion must be confined preclude a treatment of the matter in detail. An exhaustive treatment of the authenticity of the Holy Scriptures would require to take up each of the sixty-six books of our Bible, and go into all the evidence, both external and internal, and form an independent conclusion for each book. The material thus produced would be sufficient to fill a whole series of volumes on Biblical Introduction. From this vast field we select for definite discussion here a general matter, and a matter of su-

preme importance. It is the question of *the reliability of our conclusions* in the study of the problem.

Is the Christian claim for the genuineness and credibility of the Scriptures the mere baseless assumption of a credulous religious fervour, or is it supported by the scientific testimony of substantial, dependable historical data? Does our Bible function effectively only in the realm of sentiment, or does it recommend itself to the most profound and "acute" intelligence? Must we, in holding to it as our infallible guide, disregard the impartial testimony of science and history? These are just now questions of immense moment, and questions which we cannot afford to evade. The success of Christ's redemptive programme, as it faces the twentieth century, depends to an alarming degree upon how we answer these questions. We must face them squarely and honestly and with open minds.

We come now to submit the matter to a three-fold test: the test of history, the test of science, and the test of experience. If we can maintain the authenticity of the Scriptures at the tribunal of these three great acid tests, then our souls may rest upon the confident assurance that we have the best and most rational grounds for our faith.

II

THE BIBLE AND HISTORY

Is the Bible possessed of historical validity? Its records stretch away back into the remote ages of a far distant antiquity. Are those records to be depended upon? The Biblical critic of a century ago with dogmatic confidence answered this question in the negative. But the research and discoveries of the last hundred years have very seriously disturbed his complacency.

I: THE OLD TESTAMENT

The chief attack at the point of historicity has been made on the Old Testament. The critic of the early nineteenth century dogmatically declared the Old Testament to be devoid of any corroborative support, and that its testimony, standing alone, could not be accepted. He reënforced his contention with an *ad hominem* argument by referring to the dictum of our own Scriptures, that by the mouth of two or three witnesses shall any fact be established, while the Old Testament stands as a single witness, uncorroborated, and hence without historic credibility. And not content with this supposedly fatal stroke, he went on

to point out discrepancies and inconsistencies in the Old Testament itself, and to show that it did not tally with what little was known of contemporaneous history. Its representations of political conditions and the progress of events in the Far East were said to be largely fictitious. And the conservative Biblical scholar had no answer to offer, save the answer of faith, and this the critic summarily ruled out of his court of historical criticism. Thus he gloated in pride over what he considered to be the utter destruction of the historical trustworthiness of the Old Testament. But to-day, thank God, the tide has turned. The romance of archæology, the most fascinating process of modern science, has unburdened Mother Earth of untold treasures of historical data, which have thrown vast floods of light upon the Old Testament records. It seems a clear interposition of Providence that this mighty ally of truth appeared on the scene just at that moment when God's word was really becoming imperilled by the thrusts of a heartless and infidel criticism.

In 1843 Paul Emile Botta, a French consul in the region of Mesopotamia, set to work with a group of natives upon a mound near the little town of Khorsabad. First sinking a shaft directly into the summit of the mound, he struck what proved to be the edge of a great wall. With feverish excitement he urged on the work of the excavators, and it was not long before the marvellous contents of this unpretentious mound lay before

his wondering gaze. What had he found? He stood amid the gorgeous colonnades of the palace of the great Sargon! This was the Sargon mentioned by name in the twentieth chapter of Isaiah, and referred to in II Kings 17:6 as "the King of Assyria" who carried Israel into captivity. Many critics had flatly and confidently denied the existence of any such person and declared his name to be a mere invention of fancy. But now the French archæologist stood in the very palace of that great Sargon himself, and upon the walls of the edifice were rows upon rows of inscriptions, challenging the radical critic with undeniable corroboration of the Old Testament account. Of course, there was nothing left for Mr. Critic to do but to accept his humiliation and retract his dogmatic denials.

In just such fashion as this the work of the archæologist has gone forward, until to-day that ancient world of the Old Testament gleams in the white light of unchallenged history. But the critic, forced from his former position, has sought by a strained interpretation to turn these newly discovered facts into a buttress for a new set of infidel theories, thus proving that his motive is not an honest and open-minded search after truth, but a deep-seated and violent prejudice against revealed religion.

The attack on the historicity of the Old Testament has been made at five principal points: the origin and fall of the human race; the Deluge

account; the table of nations in Genesis 10; the historical reality of the Patriarchs of Israel; and the political relations of Israel with surrounding nations. If we can maintain the validity of these five important features of Old Testament history our case is unquestionably won. Our purpose here is to consider some of the objective evidences which contribute to the support of these accounts as historically reliable.

I. The origin and fall of the human race. As to the matter of the origin of the human race, this belongs properly to the discussion of the scientific test and will therefore be deferred to that place. We confine our attention here to the historical evidences for the Fall. The evolutionist denies that man has experienced a definite moral lapse, resulting in his alienation from God and the vitiation of his nature by sin. He contends that, on the contrary, man has experienced a constant moral advancement through all the milleniums of his history. We are told that what the theologian calls sin is but the survival of the brute nature in man, inherited from his brute ancestors. This brutal residue is not to be eradicated by any such process as regeneration, but is to be gradually eliminated by means of education and culture. Man in his gradual ascent from the ancestral beast has little by little thrown off those brutal characteristics, and the chief need of the race is merely to assist this process of natural development. There is no need of any regeneration, because

there has never been any depravity. The basis for this whole theory consists of the speculations of modern evolutionary science. We would place over against this speculative theorising two simple arguments based upon objective facts. Though our first argument is deductive, yet it is a perfectly obvious deduction. The second argument is purely inductive.

(1) Of course it need not be said that the facts about prehistoric man are beyond the reach of scientist or historian. Even the rankest evolutionist is compelled to declare that the origin of man lies in great obscurity. When we turn aside from the Bible there is nothing left but speculation. When we undertake to test the Biblical account of the moral experience of *prehistoric* man, the only logical method is to investigate the demonstrated moral nature of *historic* man and deduce from that our conclusions. But notice, we begin by induction, basing our knowledge of man's moral nature upon the known facts of his history. When we have thus by induction formed a basis for argument, it is perfectly legitimate and logical to proceed to a conclusion along lines of deduction. What are the demonstrable facts of man's moral nature, and what the necessary implications of those facts?

a. The first fact we note is the universal instinct of worship. There has never been a race of men known to history who did not have some form of worship. Occasionally claims have been

made of some isolated tribe having been discovered in a secluded nook of the earth which had no form of worship, but such exceptions have been too rare and uncertain to disprove the rule. All man's history testifies that he is a creature of worship. This instinct of worship has invariably led man to posit the idea of deity. His gods may be one or many, but gods he must have. Fundamental in his moral constitution are the idea of deity and the instinct of worship. Does that inherent and intuitive idea have any counterpart in reality? If not, whence did it come? Does not the belief in the actual existence of a personal God, who is in moral relation with man, best explain this demonstrable fact? Why seek a further hypothesis when this one proves itself so obviously sufficient? And as we have above stated, any further hypothesis must be based upon speculation. Why should we cast aside a hypothesis so long tried and evidently sufficient, and adopt a new one far more highly speculative? And such a policy appears infinitely more unwise when we remember that the adopting of the new theory necessitates the repudiation of that Book which has proven to be humanity's most trustworthy stay and guide. But one fact can account for such folly. The alternative theory is new and gratifies the human craving for novelty.

b. A second fact in man's moral constitution thoroughly demonstrated by history is his sense of alienation from deity. He knows instinctively

that he has offended the Infinite. All his worship has been characterised by the element of sacrifice, which bears undeniable testimony to his consciousness of sin. And not only does it bear testimony to his consciousness of sin, but it contains another necessary inference, which, though not so obvious, is still as logically implied. This inference is that there is lodged in the moral constitution of man a hope of return to a state of fellowship with God, which is his rightful possession, and the normal status of his soul. No other motive could lead to the act of sacrifice. The offer of propitiation presupposes the hope of forgiveness and restoration to divine favour.

With these historically demonstrated facts of man's moral constitution before us the most rational conclusion at which we may arrive is that man is a being with a real moral nature, possessing relations of moral responsibility with the God who created him. This being true, then his alienation from that Creator, and the moral turpitude of his nature, are facts beyond dispute. The whole face of his history is one tragic witness to this solemn truth; the matter needs no argument. Surely a benevolent God would not have created him in such a state. He must have sunk to it by a crisis of moral lapse.

(2) Our second argument is purely objective and inductive: the known traditions of the race, outside the Bible. There are two of these traditions which are in point here.

a. The first is the tradition of a Golden Age. Though the interpretation of ancient mythology has not yet progressed sufficiently for us to determine definitely just what the idea of the Golden Age was, yet it is perfectly clear that in the tribal lore of many ancient peoples there was such an idea. The belief was that somewhere, away in the distant past, there had been a period of perfect bliss and undisturbed peace. The expression of this belief was vague and hazy, taking the form very often of fanciful legend. But the very indefiniteness of the tradition lends to the proof that this conception was lodged in the deepest strata of tribal consciousness, an enigma in the past history of the race, mystifying by the distance of its removal from any known conditions of human life, and transcending the channels of ordinary human lore. The sense of a period of primeval purity has been a fact of the subconsciousness of the race.

b. We notice finally the Babylonian tradition of the Fall. Though there is no verbal record of this tradition, there is extant a figurative representation which can best be explained as arising from a tradition about the fall of man. There has been found in the region of Babylonia a cylinder, upon the surface of which is engraved the forms of a man and a woman, seated near a tree, with the head of a serpent extending over the shoulder of the woman. In the light of Genesis 3 the testimony of this cylinder is strikingly obvious. "Most scholars agree that this is a figurative represen-

tation of some tradition of the fall of man which was current among the peoples of old Babylonia" (Price: "Monuments and Old Testament," p. 89).

Thus it may be seen that deep in human tradition is imbedded the tragic fact of the Fall. We have above shown that man's moral consciousness, as demonstrated in his history, bears testimony to the same tragic fact. With these evidences to support the Bible account we may be assured that the faith is not irrational and groundless which accepts the third chapter of Genesis as an essential feature in God's revelation of redemption.

II. The Deluge account. The historical validity of the Deluge account has been called in question, in spite of the fact that it is corroborated by eight other similar accounts coming down from remotest antiquity. These accounts include representatives from all three of the world's original races. (a) Representing the Aryan, or Japhetic, races we have Flood stories in Greek, Latin, Teutonic and Hindu literature. (b) Representing the Semitic races we have Flood stories in the literary remains of Babylonia and Egypt. (c) Representing the Hamitic races we find Flood stories among the Chinese and American Indians. While these accounts differ in many minor features, the three essential facts of the Deluge are common to all. The cause is the same: the wickedness of men. The means is the same: a flood of waters. The outcome is the same: the preservation of only one

family, by whom the earth was repopled. These three main points characterise every known tradition of the Flood coming down to us from antiquity. There is not in human history a better attested fact than the Deluge, having the combined support of nine separate and practically harmonious accounts. But of these nine records left to us of that dire catastrophe, even the most superficial examination reveals the incomparable superiority of the Biblical account. By comparison with the other traditions, its simple, straightforward narration of the incidents compels the assent of any open mind to its truthfulness.

III. The table of nations. This record we find in the tenth chapter of Genesis. Two of the essential features of this record modern science has rejected: the descent of the race from three ancestors, and the centre of distribution in Southern Asia. It is denied that the human race is descended from only three ancestors. The claim is made that humanity is the product of an entire species of the animal kingdom. Just when and where that species ceased to be monkey and began to be man the scientist is unable to say. In fact, it may be that we are self-deluded in believing that we are men at all; perhaps we are only improved monkeys! The effort is made to show that the most ancient home of humanity is in Europe rather than Southern Asia. We will examine the evidences which point the truth of the Bible account.

In support of the threefold ancestry of the human race the science of comparative philology has come to the aid of the Biblical account. In human speech there are two families of language which are clearly distinct, presenting systematic structure and orderly inflection. One is the Aryan, or Indo-European, including the Sanskrit, Greek, Latin, Teutonic, Celtic, Slavic, etc. The other is the Semitic which embraces the Assyrian, Hebrew, Aramaic, Arabic, etc. With one important exception these two families of language are clearly and unquestionably distinct, pointing back to an origin in two different races, or tribes. But after we leave these two families the language of the rest of the world presents a bewildering conglomerate, almost defying classification. They present what is indeed a confusion of tongues. Instead of the orderly inflection found in the Aryan and Semitic languages we meet a vast array of monosyllables, combined by an agglutinative process into the various forms of expression. What is the original reason behind this maze of grammatical confusion and dialectical variation? The Bible offers a perfectly adequate explanation.

A careful comparison of the tenth and eleventh chapters of Genesis reveals to us that it was the descendants of Ham who undertook to build the tower of Babel. In Genesis 10:6-10 we are told that the descendants of Ham occupied the land of Shinar, and Genesis 11:2 indicates that it was the inhabitants of the land of Shinar who built

the tower of Babel. The results of this undertaking we are thoroughly familiar with. In order to frustrate their wicked self-assertion, God confounded their tongues. Hence, there went out from the place an indiscriminate mass of languages, bearing little or no relationship to one another. Consequently we should expect to find no clearly marked Hamitic family of language. This simple Biblical account is the best explanation ever offered of the linguistic chaos which we meet when we pass from the Aryan and Semitic tongues. The tribes of Shem and Japheth escaped this linguistic misfortune and were therefore able to hand down to their posterity distinct and orderly languages. But the descendants of Ham, after the episode at Babel, handed down a mongrel speech which is impossible of definite analysis and classification. We have the consequences of the Babel experience right here in the world with us to-day.

The other question raised about the Genesis table of nations is whether Southern Asia was really the centre of distribution for the human race. A flood of light has been thrown on this question by discoveries in the nineteenth century. According to Prof. Ira M. Price of the University of Chicago, the inscriptions on monuments recently discovered "verify the accuracy of more than thirty" of the names in this table "indicating both places and people" ("Monuments and Old Testament," p. 98). These names point back

to the most remote antiquity known to human history. Recent discoveries have proven that the Babylonian civilisation is the most ancient known to man. For a long time scholars gave priority to the Assyrian civilisation, but that is now known to have been derived from the Babylonian. It is quite probable that the civilisation of Egypt came from the same source. A number of inscribed tablets discovered at Tel-el-Amarna, Egypt, in 1887, and containing the diplomatic correspondence of two of the ancient monarchs of Egypt, were found to be written in the Babylonian cuneiform characters, instead of the Egyptian hieroglyphics, quite likely pointing to an ancient literary relationship between the two countries. We are told that "an invasion of the Nile Valley by Semitic nomads of Asia stamped its essential character unmistakably upon the language of the African people there. The earliest strata of the Egyptian language accessible to us betray clearly this composite origin. While still coloured with its African antecedents, the language is in structure Semitic" (Breasted: "A History of the Ancient Egyptians," p. 29). As far back as the history of Egypt can be traced there is evidence of relations with Semitic civilisation. Breasted further says, "The Semitic immigration from Asia, examples of which are also observable in the historic age, occurred in an epoch which lies far below our remotest historical horizon" (*ibid.*). That very portion of Egypt where were discov-

ered the Tel-el-Amarna tablets, referred to above, was likely the site of the earliest civilisation of Egypt, and we saw that these tablets point to Babylonian relations (cf. Breasted: "Ancient Times," p. 80). Then, as far back as the light of history extends, Asia has been the source of Egyptian life and progress. There are good reasons for believing that the civilisation of China was derived from the region about Babylonia. The ancient Sumerians, who, in vastly remote antiquity, inhabited the valley of Mesopotamia, the Biblical "land of Shinar," bore many similarities to the ancient Chinese. There is strong historical evidence that the countries of Europe were peopled by migrations from Central Asia, and back of this might most plausibly have been a migration of the original stock from the Mesopotamian valley. In fact, there is no historical evidence against, and much favouring, the hypothesis that the tribes who inhabited Europe were the descendants of Japheth. The indication from the tenth chapter of Genesis is that the posterity of Japheth moved northward.

What little evidence we have points to a prehistoric movement of the races something like this: The children of Ham first occupied the region of Mesopotamia, with the children of Shem pushed against the borders of the desert on the south and west. The children of Japheth moved northward into Central Asia and thence migrated into Europe. The Shemites, cramped by their

desert confines, gradually pressed in upon the Hamites, dispossessing them and driving them into other quarters. The Hamitic race was finally separated into two divisions, the first moving out across the Arabian desert in Egypt, the other, known to us as Sumerians, partly moving eastward and partly being absorbed by the encroaching Semitic race. Thus, when the light of history dawns, the sons of Japheth are in Europe, the sons of Ham are in China and Egypt, and the sons of Shem occupy the original home of the races in Central Asia. Later on in history Japhetic tribes return and invade the possessions of the Shemites, so that, literally, Japheth has come to "dwell in the tents of Shem" (see Genesis 9:27). There is but scant historical evidence, outside the Bible, bearing upon the early distribution of the races, but what little there is *favours the Genesis account*.

IV. A fourth point of attack upon the historicity of the Old Testament is the account of the great Patriarchs: Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, and Joseph. These are said to be merely imaginary personifications of national ideals and not real characters in Israel's history. The processes of argument by which it is sought to prove this are either subjective or negative, there not being a scintilla of positive, objective evidence against the historical reality of these heroes of Israel. On the other hand, there are at least three strong objective arguments supporting their historicity.

(1) The first is the testimony of the national consciousness of Israel. There is no possible contrivance for dating the books of the Old Testament, be it ever so arbitrary, which can prevent it from reflecting the train of Israel's actual, objective history, as a continuous stream, from Abraham to Ezra. There is just as much reason for rejecting the historical reality of David and Solomon and Rehoboam as for denying the actual existence of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob. The last resort of the critics in their pathetically desperate effort to remove the historical evidence for these patriarchs is a capricious and reckless mutilation of the text. When a book of the Old Testament mentions the names of these patriarchs only once or twice, they declare such mention to be an interpolation, and expunge it from the text. By this malicious tampering with the text they remove all evidence of any knowledge of these patriarchs from certain books of the Old Testament, and then date these books very early on the ground that they originated before the patriarch myth developed. Thus they argue in a circle. Reference to the patriarchs should be expunged from the text because the book is early, and the book must be regarded as early because it contains no reference to the patriarchal tradition. Such is an example of the kind of methods the twentieth century critic must use in his effort to overthrow the historical validity of the Old Testament.

(2) The second argument for the historicity of

the patriarchs is based upon the extreme antiquity of Israel's literary history. The Israelites came from a race, for ages untold given to writing down their history. Writing was current in Babylonia many centuries before the time of Abraham. When Abraham went down into Egypt he found there a literature already more than a thousand years old. When the Israelites settled Canaan they supplanted a people acquainted already with literary processes. The Old Testament implies in several incidental references that writing was very common among the Hebrews in the time of Moses. Certainly no one would deny that the Semitic languages present the most ancient and most continuous literature of any language in the world. As we have shown above, the Egyptian literary activity was probably borrowed from Semitic sources. In view of these facts there is no reason for denying that the history of the great patriarchs was preserved upon written records.

(3) The third argument is the "historical verisimilitude" (Beecher) of the narratives. They read exactly like history. They present distinctly the character of authentic tradition, and not of fanciful legend. These patriarchs could not be the personification of national ideals, for they are not always idealised. Even their worst faults are faithfully recorded, and they are often shown in a very unfavourable light, a disadvantage of which the author is clearly conscious. Examples

are the records of Abraham's falsehood about his relation to Sarai (Genesis 12:10-20), and Judah's gross sin against his daughter-in-law (Genesis 38:12-30). This is a trait of history, and not of legend.

To these three general arguments may be added a specific testimony from Archæology. The critics used to make much of the fact that the traditional site of Abraham's birth, Ur of the Chaldees, was wholly unknown to history. But in 1854 discoveries were made which forever set at rest any further question about Ur. We now have evidence of the exact geographical location of the city, its political status, its religion, and the character of its population. Ur of the Chaldees to-day holds an undisputed place in the annals of secular history, its knowledge being based upon the best traditional evidence yielded by Mesopotamian investigations (cf. Price: "Monuments and Old Testament," p. 99 f). Thus the patriarchal history of the Old Testament is linked with the trustworthy tradition of Babylonia at one end, and the national consciousness of Israel at the other, and presents within itself the character of authentic history. With such support as this there is no just reason for calling it into question.

V. A fifth point of attack upon the historical validity of the Old Testament is its representation of the political relations of Israel with surrounding nations. The Biblical critic of the early nineteenth century ridiculed the idea of these

despised, insignificant little tribes affecting contemporaneous history in any such way as was described by their own chronicles. But within the last seventy-five years the spade of the archæologist has utterly demolished every such objection. Upon the faces of the monuments of antiquity recently brought to light, the Northern and Southern Kingdoms of Israel are seen moving in dignity and influence among their contemporaries, accepted by them as powers to be reckoned with. The discovery of the Moabite stone in 1868 thrust forth into the light of political history the names of Omri, Ahab and Jehoram almost as vividly as they are presented by the Hebrew chronicler himself. Prof. Ira M. Price, of the University of Chicago, says of this inscription, "This old document reads almost like a new chapter of II Kings" ("Monuments and Old Testament," p. 146). The Hittites, whose existence was dogmatically denied by many scholars a century ago, have, since 1850, marched forth upon the stage of human history as one of the greatest powers of ancient times. There are literally stacks of monumental inscriptions bearing testimony, not only to their existence, but to their tremendous place in the political affairs of the ancient world.

Such instances might be multiplied many times of how recent discoveries have corroborated the records of the political history of Israel. Prof. James Orr declares that "there is hardly a point of contact with foreign powers in this period

which does not receive illustrations from the monuments" ("Problems of Old Testament," p. 426). It has long ago been demonstrated that the Bible has nothing to fear from the spade of the archæologist. Every new fact of ancient history which has come to light, *without exception*, has served to demonstrate the historical reliability of the Old Testament.

II: THE NEW TESTAMENT

The New Testament has not suffered from the attacks of criticism nearly so much as has the Old. The majority of the Biblical scholars of to-day take the New Testament seriously, as a group of documents of the highest historical importance, and the main outline of its history is regarded as authentic. As we bring upon the New Testament the test of history, only two matters need be noticed.

(1) The most damaging attack upon the historical value of the New Testament has been waged from the viewpoint of comparative religion. It is a criticism of the origins of Christianity, as to its ideas and institutions. The effort is made by a few scholars to show that Christianity has resulted from a combination of higher Judaism with the prevalent religious ideas and practices of the Græco-Roman world. Of course, to defend such a theory the critic must reject the trustworthiness of the New Testament and regard it as a hopeless

mixture of fact and fancy. Hence, to overthrow such a theory we need but to prove that the New Testament writings represent a true historical situation.

To support their theory these critics have been compelled to assume that the New Testament accounts contain a large mythical element, subjectively constructed on the basis of certain religious conceptions. But if the New Testament Scriptures contain mythical inventions, then a period of time must be postulated within which such myths have originated. It is a universally acknowledged fact that it takes several centuries for a myth to attain definite form. Hence, a period of such length must be found for the development of the Christian myths. This period cannot begin earlier than the time of Augustus Cæsar, for prior to him there is no trace of Christian ideas and practices. The period cannot end later than 325 A.D., because at this time Christianity as a completely developed religion is ushered into the full light of history as the state religion of the Roman Empire. Consequently, we may begin at 325 and push our way back to the earliest clear historical evidence of Christianity and see if time is allowed between that date and the time of Augustus Cæsar (died 14 A.D.) for the development of the supposed myths. We find that by 325 there were in existence manuscripts containing all our twenty-seven books of the New Testament. Thus the canon of the New Testament was

by this time completely crystallised, and copies of the whole had been made. For such a process as this we could not allow less than a hundred years. So our two most ancient manuscripts of the New Testament, known as Codex Vaticanus and Codex Sinaiticus, push the date of the origin of Christianity back to at least 225.

But when we get back to this date we link up with the literature of Tertullian, a statement by whom is of vast importance just here. In his "Apology" (paragraph 34), he declares that so numerous have become the Christians that they have filled every part of the Roman empire, cities and country, and isles of the sea, and that their influence has practically destroyed pagan worship. Even allowing to this statement a fair margin of exaggeration, it is wholly unreasonable to suppose that Tertullian would to any great extent misrepresent the facts to his own contemporaries, who were as familiar with the conditions as he. Hence, we must conclude that relatively the true situation at about 200-225 A.D. is represented in this remarkable statement. The adherence of such multitudes to Christianity shows that its historical validity was generally accepted at this date. Such a state of affairs must have required at least another century for development, which pushes the history back to about 125 A.D.

At this date we meet a remarkable gleam of evidence from a pagan source. This testimony is found in the letter of Pliny, a Roman official, to

the Emperor Trajan, c. 112 A.D., with reference to the proper way in which to deal with Christians brought before him for judgment. This remarkable document reveals to us that those persecuted, even to death, held to all the essential facts of Christianity, and that their number was already considerable. And the date of this document throws us back into the life of Polycarp, who was born about 69 A.D., was converted to Christianity early in life, and died a martyr about 155 A.D. It is impossible to believe that one would die for a cause which he knew to be founded upon a legendary basis. This throws the origin of the assumed myths back prior to the close of the first Christian century and leaves little more than a half century for their development, which is a psychological impossibility. And, while we have traced Christianity back along only one line of historical connection, it would be no exaggeration to say that a hundred others, equally reliable, might be constructed. There is not a group of facts in human history more convincingly attested than the facts recorded by our New Testament.

(2) Another assault of criticism upon the historicity of the New Testament has been made upon the writings of Luke, not because they present the most vulnerable point, but because they present practically the entire framework of New Testament history. While the battle has been raging around the theology of the Johannine writings, the critics have been assailing the history of the

Lucan writings. The conflict over John's theology is still at white heat, but the researches and conclusions of such scholars as Sir William Ramsay and Adolf Harnack have hushed the criticisms of Luke's historical trustworthiness almost to a whisper. A single instance will suffice to illustrate. In his account of Paul's second missionary journey, Luke refers to the chief officers of Philippi as *strategoi*, but in Thessalonica he calls them *politarchs*. The rational scholar of the last century smiled in derision at what he supposed to be a crude bungling of terms, resulting from crass ignorance of the real facts. But recent discoveries have turned that smile of sarcasm into a scowl of chagrin. It has been conclusively proven that those were exactly the terms used in those two cities in that day, and that Luke reveals most accurate knowledge by his use of them. This is but one example of the numerous instances in which the accuracy of Luke's account has been established beyond controversy. It was such triumphs as this that convinced Sir William Ramsay, who describes his own change in attitude towards Acts by saying that he, starting "with the confident assumption that the book was fabricated in the middle of the second century and studying it to see what light it could throw on the state of society in Asia Minor, was gradually driven to the conclusion that it must have been written in the first century and with admirable knowledge" ("Pauline and Other Studies," p.

199). So complete has been the victory that even Professor McGiffert, of Union Seminary, New York, has been forced to admit that Luke "is more trustworthy than previous critics allowed," and the great German scholar, Adolf Harnack, has accepted and now ably defends the historical value of Luke. It is immensely significant that Ramsay and Harnack, both of them acute scientific scholars, changed from the radical to the conservative position with reference to Luke's writings, on the basis of their own independent investigations. For the New Testament we can say, as we did for the Old, that the progress of historical investigation has served to make more clear and indisputable its claim to absolute historical dependability.

III

THE BIBLE AND SCIENCE

Perhaps in no other department of human activity has such marvellous progress been made in the last three centuries as in the realm of science. Old systems of thought and conceptions of the universe have been totally revolutionised. Facts formerly undreamed of have been brought to light, and inventions which amount almost to miracles have been achieved. This scientific movement has changed the whole face of civilisation. There has been revision and readjustment on every hand, and there has scarcely been a sphere of human activity which has not undergone modification. Many conceptions and interpretations have been necessarily discarded, in the light of demonstrated facts, and new views have taken their place. Do these newly discovered facts, and the consequent advancement in scientific thought, necessitate a change in men's views of the Bible as a written revelation from God? While men have been revising their interpretation of the universe, has the Bible necessarily suffered from the changing viewpoint? It is this question which we wish squarely to face just now. As we approach it, three matters present themselves for our consideration.

I: THE SCIENTIFIC METHOD AS APPLIED TO
BIBLE STUDY

Just at this point there has been much confusion and misunderstanding: wherefore wisdom requires that we proceed with caution. There is a type of Bible study which has masqueraded under the guise of science, when in reality it was but an unscientific assault upon religion, prompted by intense prejudice. As a result of this malicious handling of the Scriptures by some so-called scientists, the devout have grown keenly suspicious of science as a method. Indeed, there are some over-enthusiastic advocates of orthodoxy who openly condemn science, dogmatically declaring, with bombastic zeal, "We'll take the Bible as the final word of truth, science or no science." When we come to analyse such an attitude, it is far more fatal to the Bible and religion than it is to science. To maintain such a position is to say that we will base Christianity upon religious presumption rather than upon rational faith. That attitude can never succeed, for it has no appeal to offer to rational beings. We will accept the Bible as true, because it is true, and demonstrably true, and for no other reason.

Christianity of the twentieth century must recognise that it will gain nothing, but will seal its own doom, if it evades any question proposed by the modern scientific spirit. The necessity is laid upon us to make out our case the best we can and

await a verdict from the court of unprejudiced scientific inquiry. What if that court should render an adverse decision, and declare Christianity to be a superfluous and untenable religious theory? In so far as the decisions were based upon an unbiased and exhaustive investigation of the facts in the case, we would be forced to yield to the verdict. But we need suffer no uneasiness when Christianity receives a fair trial before the tribunal of facts. The vast and tragically solemn task before the devoted disciple of evangelical Christianity at this hour is to see to it that the investigation is fair and thorough. It is true, our conclusions will be called in question because we enter the investigation with prepossessions in favour of the Christian religion, but the facts and phenomena to which we call attention will demand—and will obtain—careful consideration. Hence, the method for us to pursue in the defence of the fundamentals of Christianity is not the dogmatic declaration of our views, but a careful and scientific array of the facts upon which those views are based.

The thing most necessary to clarify the thinking of people at this delicate point is an understanding of the nature of *true* science (not that which so often parades itself as science). What is true science? It is the effort to ascertain the demonstrable facts of the universe, and the willingness to accept the conclusions made necessary by a sane and unbiased interpretation of those

facts. Human reason cannot possibly follow any other plan of thought and investigation. If we investigate we must search for facts; we cannot think without thinking toward a rational conclusion. To reject the validity of such a process is to dethrone the rationality of the human mind, and when that is done, neither the Bible, nor religion, nor anything else in the realm of the soul is of any value. True science offers the only avenue in which the human mind can work, and to avoid it we must either suppress the activity of the mind or deny the validity of its processes. Either course would be rational suicide. Science is an unavoidable necessity in the intellectual progress of the race. Study, research, investigation are impossible without it. Then if we are to really study our Bible and apply to it the legitimate processes of thought, we must submit it to the tests of science. That is, we must seek to ascertain the facts about our Bible, and accept the conclusions made necessary by those facts. The only possible method for Bible study is a scientific method.

This means that the application of science to the Bible is inevitable. We have seen that the necessity appears from two directions: the state of intellectual advancement, made possible by the enlightening influences of Christianity; and the very nature of the rational constitution of man. The twentieth century will, without any question, see the Bible tried before the bar of science, and

it is also true that the twentieth century will accept the verdict as final. What will be the outcome? This is the gravest question Christianity has ever faced. Is there any way by which we can, with any degree of assurance, anticipate what the results will be? There is one method by which we may be reasonably assured as to the outcome. A closer examination of the true nature of the scientific method will suffice to put our hearts completely at rest on the question.

The scientific method involves two essential processes: the discovery of facts, and the interpretation of those facts. The first step in science, then, is the effort to discover facts. Has Christianity anything to fear from such a process? Is there any body of truth anywhere in the universe upon which Christianity should be afraid to have the light thrown? If so, then Christianity is either unjustifiable in the claims it makes for itself or mistaken in its view of God. If it is the final religion, and divinely revealed, and if God is omnipotent and all-wise, then there is no place where the truth of God's religion can conflict with the truth of God's universe. Christianity cannot maintain itself in the light of its own interpretation of its character as a religion and oppose or ignore the real results of true science. The God who planned His religion, also planned His universe; consequently, all the facts of the universe should be in vital and harmonious relation to all the truths of Christianity. Every new fact discov-

ered should throw greater light upon the Bible and its significance for the race. Therefore, Christianity should prove an incentive to scientific research, rather than a reason for its suppression.

This spirit of search after truth involves two necessary implications which are essential to the life and progress of both Christianity and science. The first is the necessity to assume that there is such a thing as truth in the universe; and, second, that the human mind is capable of discovering and comprehending that truth. Without these two necessary assumptions the Bible and science would both be left utterly meaningless, for they are both concerned essentially and exclusively with the revelation and interpretation of truth. If there is no truth, or if man is unable to apprehend it, then what function is left for science and the Bible? Nothing could be more rankly unscientific than the theory now being advocated in some circles of modern scholarship, that there is no such thing as final and absolute truth. Such a theory renders science nothing more than a process of intellectual gymnastics, for, according to this view, science would have no goal, and hence nothing real which it could accomplish. We must rely upon the intuitive sense of the human soul that there is truth and reality in the universe, and with faith in God as our incentive and the Bible as our guide, face out to the universe to discover and apply the truth which we believe it contains.

The second matter involved in the scientific

method is the *interpretation* of facts. Here there is need for the exercise of great discrimination. Many an honest soul has been misled by mistaking an interpretation of facts for the facts themselves. We must always remember that inference necessarily mediates between facts and the conclusions deduced therefrom, and take care to test thoroughly the validity of such inference before accepting the conclusion. The validity of an inference is to be determined by (1) its basis: the extent of the induction from which it has been drawn; (2) its method: the logic employed in deducing it; (3) its motive: whether or not it is vitiated by prejudice or prepossession. Just here we find the Plain of Esdraelon of the scientific world. The battles are to be fought at this point. It is the point at which science and philosophy overlap, and the victory belongs to that group which recommends itself most favourably to the reason and experience of the race. Christianity is to win its battle in the final stage by its *interpretation* of the facts of human life and the universe.

The only thing that need give Christianity concern in the application of the scientific method is to see to it that all the facts involved are properly recognised and submitted to a reasonable interpretation. Some of these facts we may briefly review.

I. *The unique and superior religious consciousness of the Hebrew nation in all their known history.* There is by no means universal agreement

as to the date at which Israel as a nation appears in the light of authentic history, but fairly general consent could be obtained to placing it as far back as 1000 B.C., and to say 800 B.C., would be to remove practically all possibility of challenge. Indeed, the evidences are quite convincing for a date even earlier than the first one mentioned. In this connection Dr. John R. Sampey ("Syllabus for Old Testament Study," p. 102) gives the following interesting summary of Prof. James Robertson's argument in his book on "The Early Religion of Amos and Hosea":

(1) These prophets had a rich vocabulary of moral and theological terms, implying a rich degree of religious culture prior to their time.

(2) They displayed literary skill such as would argue for a high development of the Hebrew language and literature before their time.

(3) Both of these prophets, as well as Micah and Isaiah, far from regarding themselves as pathfinders in thought and practice, speak of their work as a return to the law of God given in former times. They plainly regard themselves as reformers, not innovators.

In the light of these unanswerable arguments, one cannot deny that Israel had a distinct national history at least three to four hundred years prior to Amos and Hosea, "who are admitted by all parties to have lived and laboured in the eighth century B.C." (Sampey). Then even those who deny the historical validity of the Pentateuch

must regard Israel as dating prior to 1000 B.C., and in their earliest appearance in the light of history they present a remarkably high state of religious consciousness. Whence did it come? Christianity offers the best hypothesis in answer to this question.

II. *The remarkable and unparalleled career of Jesus of Nazareth, as testified to by the impression made upon his own generation.* We must remember that the account and interpretation of Jesus presented in the gospels and epistles of our New Testament were not given by those who lived in generations subsequent to His lifetime, but by those who were practically contemporaneous with Him. Thus if the representation of His supernatural character is mythical, such myths must needs have been constructed by those who knew Him in the flesh. Such an hypothesis is contrary to all the known tendencies of human psychology, as we have already shown. The conception of Jesus which He left in the mind of His own generation is a fact of history with which science must reckon, and we can find no better explanation of that fact than that offered by Christianity.

III. *The superior character of the religious conceptions and ethical ideals of historical Christianity.* From the noble religious and ethical idealism of the New Testament down to the present movement, Christianity has offered to the world the highest spiritual and moral objectives known to history. How will science explain the origin of

this superb philosophy of life? To say that it was invented by a group of untutored Palestinian Jews will scarcely satisfy an unbiased mind. A more plausible naturalistic explanation is that it is a revision of the best elements of first century Judaism. But whence did these simple Jews of Palestine (for if Jesus was only a man, He was likewise only an unlettered Jew) derive the surpassing ethical and spiritual insight necessary to make a revision which would so far transcend the original conceptions? Science is still halting at Christianity's explanation of this fact.

IV. *The facts of consciousness in the religious experience of a Christian life.* Though these facts are subjective, they are nevertheless facts. In the typical Christian experience there comes first an intense sense of sin, and a consequent feeling of condemnation in the sight of God. In this state of consciousness the individual voluntarily commits his case into the hands of Christ and depends upon Him for release from the distressing sense of sin which possesses him. In multiplied millions of cases this self-committal to Christ has resulted in a distinct sense of transition into a new and vastly improved state of consciousness, out of which have come clean and useful lives. In this new life, which the individual enters upon as a result of this conscious change in his experience, he feels a sense of contact between his own spirit and some Infinite and sympathising Spirit external to himself. This he regards as communion

with Christ, with God, or with the Holy Spirit, three expressions describing the same type of experience. This sense of contact with the Infinite oftentimes becomes very vividly real. The invalid Christian woman told the visiting minister that, while friends and relatives could not always remain at her bedside, she was never lonely, "because," said she, "Jesus is always here." There we have a fact of consciousness, and one which science has no right to ignore. The facts within our experience mean far more to us than any fact beyond our experience. Shall we follow a science that seeks to belittle or ignore these glorious facts of Christian experience? Let us demand that science, in its processes of research, give due consideration to the data of Christian consciousness.

We have reviewed four groups of facts, the religious history of Israel, the career of Jesus of Nazareth, the spiritual and moral ideals of Christianity, and the experiences of the Christian life. These compose the foundations of our religion, hence Christianity rests upon a basis of scientific fact. We need not oppose science in its true nature, but we should draw swords and declare perpetual warfare upon that philosophic attitude which enters the field of religious phenomena with a preconceived prejudice against the supernatural. Such an effort is not science, but infidel, materialistic philosophy, and as Christians we will meet its representatives at the bar of true science,

and substantiate our religion and our Bible on the basis of pure, demonstrable facts.

II: THE BIBLE AND NATURAL SCIENCE

In the very beginning let it be said that the Bible is only very slightly amenable to natural science. It is not a book of science, but a book of religion. When the scientist challenges the reliability of the Word of God on the basis of his own theories, he is trespassing upon a sphere in which he has no right. In only a few points does the Bible have any contact at all with the field of natural science, and where such contact does occur, there has never been demonstrated a contradiction between the Bible and the *known facts* of science. Many of the subjective speculations of a certain school of modern scientists are in exact opposition to the Bible, but these speculations have never yet found any demonstrable proof. The discovery of actual objective facts in the realms of Geology, Biology and Sociology have found a most remarkable agreement with the early chapters of Genesis. The conflict has arisen because of certain deductions which materialistic scientists have drawn from these facts. There is no reason in the world why we should accept these deductions and throw overboard the plain statements of the Book which has had for us all the value of a special divine revelation. Real science, rather than disturbing, has more firmly fixed the

validity of the Bible account of the origin of things.

It has now become trite to remark that the most severe contest between the Bible and modern science is the conflict of the Genesis account of creation with the theory of evolution. These two accounts of the origin of things are hopelessly at variance. Efforts to harmonise them have done violence to both evolution and the Bible. Either the Bible is right and the evolutionist wrong, or the evolutionist right and the Bible wrong.

The two cannot logically occupy common ground. The heart of the whole evolutionary hypothesis is the contention that the visible universe has *developed by reason of forces inherent in nature*. The Bible record represents the universe as having been *created by reason of a will which transcends nature*. These two views of the origin of the universe are essentially contradictory.

The evolutionary hypothesis has been developed along these different lines. Geological evolution deals with the origin and formation of the earth. Biological evolution has to do with the physical development of plants and animals. Sociological evolution is concerned with the growth of human customs—domestic life, civic organisation and religion. Let us see in just a word how nearly these three branches of evolutionary science have demonstrated their hypothesis. First, we would make the general observation that the whole question of

origin is utterly beyond the reach of really scientific methods. Science can only deal with the known phenomena of nature, history, or experience. How may man ever know the phenomena of the ultimate origin of the universe? In that matter he can never secure known facts; he is left to choose between revelation and speculation.

(1) But let us see how these evolutionary theories compare with the facts of the universe and history that are known. We turn first to the geological phase of the question. Prof. Thomas H. Morgan of Columbia University declares: "The direct evidence furnished by fossil remains is by all odds the strongest evidence we have in favour of organic evolution" ("A Critique of the Theory of Evolution," p. 24). And yet so high an authority on evolution as Thomas H. Huxley is compelled to admit, "In the present condition of our knowledge and of our methods, one verdict—*not proven and not provable*—must be recorded against all grand hypotheses of the palæontologist representing the general succession of life on the globe" ("Discourses," pp. 279-288). So we find one disciple of Darwin declaring that geological evidence is the strongest proof of evolution, and another confessing that geological evidence is as yet wholly unreliable. Taken from the standpoint of geology, evolution lacks much of being a demonstrated hypothesis. The strongest argument in print against this phase of the evolutionary hypothesis is to be

found in the works of George McCready Price, especially his recent book under the title of "Q. E. D.", published by Fleming H. Revell Company.

(2) How does the theory fare in the realm of history? Here we need but to quote a single statement from LeConte, "It is evident, then, that if we, with Darwin, take natural selection as the most important known factor, the really most important cause of evolution is the *cause* of varieties. This is the *unknown* fundamental factor" ("Evolution," p. 80). Thus it is conceded by this ardent defender of the evolutionary hypothesis that the very foundation of organic evolution—the cause of varieties—is lacking, which means that the theory has *no foundation in fact*. Therefore, organic evolution cannot stand as a really scientific explanation.

Quite an excited discussion has recently been evoked in the realm of biological science by the discovery of the so-called "Rhodesian man." This Rhodesian man consists of a few fragments of a human skeleton—including a well-preserved skull—discovered in a cave in Africa. As has repeatedly been done in similar instances in the past, when this discovery was first made, many impulsive, would-be scientists seized upon the premature conclusion that the "missing link" between man and the ape had come to light. It was declared that this skeleton bore evidences which placed it somewhere between the lowest previously

known form of man and the highest known form of the animal species. But the closer scrutiny of the best scientists has led to the conclusion that the skeleton represents a typical human being, presenting no feature which prevents it being classed as the remains of a primitive man; admittedly of a very low order of human development, but still a *man*. Prof. R. I. Pocock, an eminent English scientist, is quoted by the *Literary Digest* (January 28, 1922) as having said with reference to the Rhodesian man that "the leg bones were typically human," and that "the palate and teeth and other cranial features are human in type." This scientist further states, "An answer can now be given to your question: 'Have researches into the past history of man revealed the existence of a species combining to such an extent the characters of apes and men as to deserve the title "Missing Link"?' The answer is emphatically 'No.' Admittedly, every one of the species above enumerated shows in a varying degree apelike characteristics more or less lost in existing man; but so far as the material available warrants an opinion, they all belong unmistakably to the human family. Even the so-called ape-man of Java, which has the most ape-like skull-top of all, must be classified as a man on account of the structure of his legs. The same would apply, in my opinion, to the Rhodesian man, even if his skull and teeth were much more ape-like than they are." Thus this scientist, himself

an evolutionist, admits that evolution is wanting in demonstration at the most important point.

(3) In the realm of sociological evolution the feature of foremost importance to us is religion. The modern psychologist and sociologist consider religion as the result of certain developmental processes, ultimately originating in physical sensations. First, there appears the fetishism of the savage—the worship of stocks and stones, with the superstitious notion that they are inhabited by good and evil spirits. Later there develops a higher form of religion, more spiritual in its essential concept. This is the belief in a group of supernatural beings, controlling nature and life. Finally, comes the idea of One Supreme Being, who crowds out all other deities and monopolises worship. Thus polytheism evolves into monotheism. The strength of the whole theory rests upon the assumption that polytheism antedates monotheism. But the overwhelming evidence of history points to the contrary. We wish just here to quote at length from Professor Graebner, of the Concordia Seminary, St. Louis, Mo.:

“If man was developed from the lower order of creatures or from any member of the animal kingdom, religion must have been a late development. That this ‘tailless, catarrhine, anthropoid ape’ should have had anything resembling a religion, is, of course, not to be thought of. To imagine that he had a knowledge of the one true God, His nature and His attributes, would be pre-

posterous. How then explain the origin and rise of religion? The evolutionists do not agree on this subject. Herbert Spencer maintains that *Animism* was the most primitive form of faith. Man revered spirits, the ghosts of the departed, then raised them to the eminence of divinities and finally developed the idea of *one* absolute being, God. Others suggest that primitive man first adored the terrible powers and awful phenomena of nature, was thus led to Polytheism (a religion of many gods) and finally evolved Monotheism (a belief in one God). But all agree in this, that Religion in its earliest form was of a very crude and elementary character, and only in the course of many thousands of years, attained to the conception of one Supreme Being. There was first a faith in gods—Polytheism, and much later a faith in God—Monotheism.

“Now, let it be observed that this is the only *possible* view from the standpoint of Evolution. Remember that this doctrine is not only conceived as bearing on the development of the animal kingdom. The principle is assumed to operate in the development of the earth, of man, of society, of government, of manufactures, of language, of literature, science, art, and religion. According to the theory there must have been progress from a crude form of spirit-worship of gods, and thence to a worship of one God. But what are the facts? Has religion so developed? It has not.

“*Not only has history failed to show a single*

form of belief which has advanced in the manner demonstrated, but every religion, no matter how pure and exalted, has gone through a process of degeneration, of devolution.

“The founders of the comparative study (or science) of religion, and the greatest authorities in its various departments, are practically unanimous in their opinion, that all pagan systems of mythology and religion contain remnants of a more exalted form of belief, of a higher, clearer knowledge of the Divinity, which gradually became dimmed and corrupted.

“From Max Müller’s Lecture on the ‘Vedas’ (the ancient hymns of India) we quote the following: As a result ‘to which a comparative study of religion is sure to lead, we shall learn that religions in their most ancient form, or in the minds of their authors, are generally free from many of the blemishes that attach to them in later times.’

“Le Page Renouf expresses his entire agreement with the ‘Matured judgment’ of Emanuel de Rougé: ‘The first characteristic of the Egyptian religion is the unity of God most energetically expressed: God, One, Sole and Only—no others with Him . . . the Only Being. . . . The belief in the unity of the Supreme God and in His attributes as Creator and Lawgiver of man, whom He has endowed with an immortal soul, . . . *these are the primitive notions, enshased in the midst of superfetations accumulated in the centuries.*’

Franz Lenormant reached the same conclusion. Elsewhere, Renouf says: 'It is incontestably true that the sublimer portions of the Egyptian religions are not the comparatively late result of a process of development. The sublimer portions are demonstrably ancient; and the last stage of the Egyptian religion . . . was by far the grossest and most corrupt' ('Religion of Ancient Egypt,' p. 95).

"The history of the Hindu belief presents testimony of a still more startling nature. In the 'Vedas' we find statements and prayers which are clear proof of an early Monotheism. . . . And yet this faith in one God in the course of time degenerated into a worship of 33,000 divinities—until Gautama the Buddha evolved a system that denied the very existence of God.

"Turning to Greece we have the testimony of Prof. Max Müller to this effect: 'When we ascend to the distant heights of Greek history the idea of God, as the Supreme Being, stands before us as a simple fact' ('Essays,' II, p. 146). Carl Boettcher, in his great work on the Treeworship of the Greeks, maintains: 'As far as the legends of the Greeks can be traced into prehistoric ages, the entire nation worshipped a single God, nameless, without statues, without a temple, invisible and omnipresent.' Every student of Greek literature knows that this original belief at an early age gave place to a worship of the gods of

Olympus, a worship which in turn gave way to openly avowed atheism."

It is quite likely that the earliest conception of God among the ancestors of the Greeks was designated simply "the heaven father" (*ho ouranos pater*). When a definite name was assigned to the Deity it seems to have been something like "deos." From this came the name, *Zeus*, applied to the chief god of the Hellenic pantheon; the Greek word *theos* for God; the Latin *deus*, God; and *Thor*, the chief deity of the early European tribes.

Professor Graebner goes on to give conclusive evidence of an original monotheism in the religions of the Phœnicians, Persians, Arabians, Sumerians, and Babylo-Assyrians (see Thomas Graebner, "Evolution; an Investigation and a Criticism," pp. 104-112). Prof. B. A. Copass, of the Southwestern Seminary, has evidence which points unquestionably to an original monotheism among the Chinese. So far as the evidence of history can be deduced, the earliest form of religion known to man was monotheism. This is a fatal contradiction to the whole evolutionary theory.

Thus it may be seen how much evolution lacks of being a demonstrated fact of science. "Evolution is a theory, a philosophy, it is not a science" (Graebner, "Evolution," p. 11). It still remains an unproven hypothesis, further from proof to-day than when Charles Darwin gave to it its first

effective expression and promulgation. Why should we exchange our faith in the Bible, and in the simple Genesis account of creation, for this bold guess of a few speculative scientists? When faith in God's Word constitutes the foundation of the richest experience of life, is there any wonder that one should refuse to renounce it for the unproven hypothesis of a materialistic philosophy?

We hear much from the critics about the unscientific world view of the Biblical writers. That the world view of the age in which they lived was unscientific we do not deny. It finds its crude, and sometimes even ridiculous, expression in much of the literature contemporaneous with the Bible. The pseudepigraphic book of Enoch may be cited as an illustration. In chapters seventeen to thirty-six the writer describes three tours of Enoch through the universe, and his conception of the universe is palpably limited and crude. Chapters seventy-two to eighty-two of the book are even a more striking example. "Here Enoch favours us with all sorts of astronomical information which he himself had obtained from the angel Uriel" (Schurer). He learns some very startling things about the operations of the sun, moon and stars, ideas which cause a twentieth century student to smile as he reads. That the Bible writers as men of their own times shared these erroneous conceptions is too certain to permit of dispute. The remarkable and significant fact is that in no

place do we find the Bible vitiated by these crude ideas. The only traces of the prevalent world view occur in current forms of expression, and form no part of the essential line of thought. The only satisfactory way in which to account for this remarkable phenomenon is by the inspiring guidance of the Holy Spirit.

III: THE BIBLE AND LITERARY SCIENCE

Though we may declare the *natural* scientist to be out of his place when he seeks to assail the Bible with the products of his materialistic speculations, we must without hesitation admit that our Scriptures are amenable to the science of *literary* criticism. We beg the whole question if we seek to shield the Bible from any of the processes applied to any other piece of literature. In this field the battle has raged for centuries. The rationalistic scholar has employed every known method of literary criticism in his desperate effort to destroy the validity of the Christian Scriptures. But out of an age of turmoil the Bible to-day arises in an ever clearer triumph.

(1) In the New Testament the conclusions of representatives from both the radical and conservative wings of Biblical criticism have practically settled all questions. Among these scholars we find such names as Bernhard Weiss and Har-nack of Germany; Westcott, Hort, and Scrivener of England; Kirsopp Lake and Edgar J. Good-

speed of America. The substantial agreement of these scholars, representing both sides of the struggle, establishes on grounds of absolute confidence the textual integrity of the New Testament.

(2) But with the Old Testament the case is not so fortunate. Conservatives and radicals are at opposite extremes of opinion on many points. Let us take a brief glance at some of the representative results of the best scholarship of to-day, that we may see who has the advantage in the conflict. Two things have been conclusively demonstrated to the open and unprejudiced mind; namely, the unity of design in the Old Testament, and the literary integrity of the Pentateuch. The literary masterpieces which stand to-day as monuments to the triumph of these two results of Old Testament criticism are "The Problem of the Old Testament," by Prof. James Orr, of Scotland, and "The Higher Criticism of the Pentateuch," by Prof. W. H. Green, of Princeton Theological Seminary.

a. The one golden chain which runs throughout the Old Testament, linking its every part into one harmonious whole, is the thought of a mission of redemption for Israel. This is the background of what Beecher calls the "Promise Doctrine" of the Old Testament. This redemptive mission first breaks into clear light at the call of Abraham in the opening verses of the twelfth chapter of Genesis. From this point to the last chapter of

Malachi, the background of the whole history is this mission of Israel from Jehovah, to give His name and His glory to the nations. The critics seek to explain this by saying that it is a product of the national consciousness of Israel. This we grant. But I should like to ask them, whence came that national consciousness? They prefer to assume that it is the result of certain evolutionary processes. We have just as much right and vastly more reason to assume that it is the result of a direct revelation from God. The whole Old Testament is built around that idea, and exhibits a most natural and logical development of God's redemptive purpose. This the most radical critic would not now attempt to deny. His subterfuge would be an effort to explain it upon naturalistic grounds.

b. As to the integrity of the Pentateuch, criticism has assailed it with what is known as the Documentary Hypothesis. This theory denies that the Pentateuch was written by Moses, or any other one man, and seeks to show how at least four documents, if not more, have contributed to our present Pentateuch—or Hexateuch, because Joshua is included in the theory. This documentary theory fares fine in Genesis and part of Exodus, but falls into hopeless confusion beyond this point, utterly collapsing when it reaches Deuteronomy and Joshua. No two Old Testament scholars have ever reached even substantial agreement as to how the division should be made

in the last three books of the Pentateuch, except where one scholar has simply accepted the proposals of another without attempting any independent verification. This bewildering confusion but shows the futility of the effort to disintegrate the five books of Moses. On the other hand, there is strong evidence pointing toward unity of structure. There is no part of the Bible which submits itself to more natural or logical analysis. This evident logical structure argues strongly against the Pentateuch being a mere patchwork. The effort of radical criticism to force upon the Pentateuch a theory to which it most obviously does not yield is proof positive that the theory is not based upon an induction from all the facts, but is purely a subjective assumption. The textual integrity of the Old Testament is still far from being impaired, in spite of the malicious thrusts of several centuries of criticism.

IV

THE BIBLE AND EXPERIENCE

Here we approach by far the most important question of all. What has been the effect of the Bible in the sacred realm of human life and character? What aid has it rendered the soul of man in his upward struggle toward higher and nobler ideals? What has the Bible wrought in the realm of human experience? Here we have the supreme test. If the Bible has failed to function in this sphere, then it has no claim upon our acceptance; if it has functioned here, then we have the strongest possible argument for its validity. In the application of this test we would submit three propositions.

I. The facts and requirements of man's moral and religious nature demand a revelation from God. We have used the moral phenomena of human nature in a previous argument, but will here go more into detail in our investigations.

This question throws us back upon three other questions, all of which lie at the heart of the Christian religion. (1) Is there a God, an infinite Being, Creator and Ruler of the universe, having a loving personal interest in man as His moral creation? (2) What are the real facts about man's

moral and religious nature? (3) Do these facts call for a revelation, and, if so, what kind of a revelation? While these questions are staggering in their proportions, the hour is upon us when they must be answered. It cannot be hoped for this brief dissertation that it can do more than call attention to some of the more important phases of these immense problems.

Regarding the first question, as to the existence of a personal God, the very nature of it prohibits the introduction of objective proof. There is no way to prove—nor to disprove—the existence of a God. This matter must be left to the choice of each individual, to assume or to deny, as his personal inclinations may direct. This is not to say, however, that Christianity has no reason for believing in one true God. Though this belief is not subject to objective demonstration, it is by no means irrational. On the other hand, in the face of all the facts and phenomena of the universe, it is far more rational to assume that there is a God than to assume that there is not one. Christianity has at least four reasons for believing in the existence of God.

(1) There is the prevalence and persistence of the idea in human history. There has never lived a race of human beings upon the earth who have not manifested some sort of conception of deity. The few and doubtful instances which seem to be exceptions to this rule are not sufficient to disprove it. More mature observation and investi-

gation will likely reveal that the few cases of isolated tribes of human beings now thought to have no idea of a God really have some very crude and unusual form of worship. But even if this result should never be reached, two or three remote cases as compared with the witness of all the vast stretches of human history would make a very weak argument in proving by an inductive method that the God-idea is an accident of experience, resulting from fortuitous processes of development. It cannot be denied that the act of worship is a general characteristic of the human race. It is certain that this instinctive act must be the operation of an intuitive idea. The Christian's argument is that this intuitive idea has its corresponding reality, which is God.

(2) In its essential constitution the human mind demands a great First Cause. Man cannot think independent of the relationship of cause and effect. The one great question with which he instinctively faces the universe about him is, "why?" To deny the necessity or validity of that instinctive query of the human mind is to impeach all man's rational processes and throw the world of science and philosophy into hopeless chaos. The very basal reason for the pursuit of scientific inquiry is confidence in the reliability of man's rational faculties. Then his intuitive demand for a cause preceding every effect is just and right. This demand leads us inevitably to a great First Cause, which is itself uncaused, hence

infinite and eternal. What is that First Cause? The Christian answers, God.

(3) The evidence of design in the universe demands an original Intelligence. Again we face the alternative of accepting or impeaching the rational requirements of the human mind. We are incapable of conceiving of a plan without a planner. If there is really order and system in the universe, it must have been ordained and arranged by some over-ruling Mind. And that there is order and system here, one cannot deny. Unvarying regularity of movement and function, methodical reproduction of form and kind, cannot be explained as a matter of recurring accident. Such phenomena could be produced only by a well-ordered plan. Hence, there must be a Planner. The Christian claims that this original Planner is God.

(4) The assumption of moral order in the world requires a standard of righteousness. Of course, it is a much debated question as to whether or not society in any given age can claim any such ideal as moral order. The scale of ethics is said to be a relative and hopelessly varying proposition. This is to claim that nothing is *per se* right or wrong. Murder is not a thing wrong within itself, but happens to be condemned by the ethical standards of a certain generation. Thus, we might legalise murder for a sufficient length of time for it to become one of the notable and praiseworthy virtues of human life, and the indi-

vidual who had ruthlessly slain the largest number of his fellowmen would be *rightfully* extolled as the hero of his generation. It is hardly to be feared that such a theory will ever be taken seriously by the multitudes of thinking men. Humanity as a whole will continue to proceed upon the presumption that there is such an ideal for social progress as absolute moral order. But there cannot be order without organising principle. There must be some prescribed system by which moral order is to be secured. There must be some criterion to which it can be adjusted. Now the only conceivable organising principle in moral order is a dependable, unvarying standard of morality, or ideal of righteousness. The Christian proposes as this ideal of righteousness the character of a holy God.

Other reasons might be added for the belief in the existence of God, but these are sufficient to indicate that the conception is by no means an irrational assumption. But just how may we obtain the idea that this God is characterised by a loving interest in His moral creation? We reply that the character of God must at least be thought of as on a parallel with the highest ideals of humanity, and human nature has attained nothing higher than the thought of unselfish, provident love. We cannot think of God in a character inferior to the supreme ideals of men. So the only God which a rational faith can assume is ~~a~~ definite, holy, and benevolent Person.

The next question which we raise projects our study into the sphere of inductive proof. What are the real facts about man's moral and religious nature? The investigation required for an exhaustive examination of this problem is more than any single individual would dare attempt. Without hesitation or apology, we must avail ourselves of the results which others have achieved, examine the data they have assembled, test the methods by which they have proceeded, and thus pass judgment upon the validity of their conclusions. We confine ourselves here to a few general, but we believe trustworthy and pertinent, observations.

We would remark, first, that the moral and religious instincts of man's nature belong to the highest faculties of his being. The best that man can ever achieve will be in obedience to the impulses arising from this phase of his nature. There need be no fear that this statement could be successfully challenged. In fact, no sincere mind would even feel inclined to question it. Whatever might be one's view of how these instincts have functioned, whence they are ultimately derived, or what the final goal to which they may lead the race, there can be no doubt of the unanimous verdict of every sincere and earnest thinker that they are productive of the best which human life can secure, and represent the highest functions of the soul. This fact, obvious, simple, commonplace though it is, is of incalculable import in its bearing upon the vital

question before us. We are looking for facts, and this is the first and most obvious fact in the sphere which we are investigating. What are some of its implications?

It has an important bearing upon the study of man's moral and religious nature as to its origin. If this higher nature is a result of mere processes of development, then originally it must have consisted in some crude form of physical sensation. These physical sensations produced other related physical sensations, and such a reproduction continued until we get the present highly developed moral constitution of man. But the difficulty is that man's moral and religious sensibility does not reside in his physical being. It is distinctly a phase of his rational nature. Hence we are thrown back upon the fundamental psychological problem of accounting for man's rational nature by a chain of developing physical sensations. To accept the theory that man's religious capacity is a result of moral development and not a divine endowment compels one to accept the theory that the rational nature of man is ultimately derived from manifestations of matter. This theory necessarily obliterates all the distinction between the physical and rational and explains all the psychic operations of man's being as modes of matter, mere sensations of the flesh. The young man's ambition to succeed in life in the highest possible degree is genetically in the same category of sensations as his hunger for bread or his desire for

sexual gratification. In fact, this theory of psychology would regard the first sensation as genetically very closely related to the other two. To accept this explanation of human personality is to regard the noblest impulses of man's spiritual being as originating in the basest instincts of his nature. Certainly, such a hypothesis must be demonstrated beyond any possibility of doubt before it can secure general acceptance.

Again, we are confronted with the fact that these higher impulses of man's moral and religious nature are in perpetual conflict with the lower instincts of his being. And this conflict is not accidental. It is demanded by the inevitable consequences of these two opposing sets of impulses. If a man follows the unrestrained promptings of his baser nature, he yields to a life of gross and revolting indulgence and dissipation. If he submits to the disposition of his higher nature, he refrains from all such indiscriminate indulgence, forcibly disciplines his physical appetites, and devotes his energies to the accomplishment of ends in which the lower sensibilities of his being become but incidental and subservient means. In a developmental process, originating with primordial phenomena of matter in simplest forms of life, it is difficult to see how there could have grown up in human consciousness the sense of this irreconcilable opposition between the two tendencies of man's being. He who seeks to explain man's spiritual nature upon an exclu-

sively naturalistic basis must solve this difficulty.

We have already observed that in the sphere of man's religious capacity there has, almost without exception, originated some idea of deity, either polytheistic or monotheistic in form. The prevalence of a disposition to worship has been sufficiently universal to convince the unprejudiced mind that it is a native instinct of the race. Whence and why does this disposition to worship arise? What is the faculty of man's moral nature which leads him to worship? Many have defined it as an intuitive conception of deity. But in the face of the facts of man's religious history this appears doubtful. The conceptions of deity have been too widely varied to admit of a common intuitive origin. It seems more likely that the fundamental element in man's moral nature is an instinct for worship. Man is intuitively disposed to a sense of subordination to and dependence upon some power transcending the realm of his tangible environment. It is an instinctive sense of relationship to that which is beyond all the known phenomena of his natural life. It is difficult to frame a naturalistic theory which will satisfactorily account for this instinct and its marvellous results in the history of the race.

On the basis of these observations, we offer the following conclusions. The facts of man's moral and religious nature, as far as we now know them, point to an origin and regulation in development which cannot conceivably result from the

blind forces of nature. The Christian hypothesis for the explanation of these facts is the creating and guiding activity of an omnipotent God. The world has yet to await any better hypothesis.

We come now to the third question involved in our problem. What bearing do these facts have upon the need for a revelation? We have seen that the hypothesis called for by these facts is an infinite and holy God, who has created and endowed a race of moral beings, in whose progress and destiny He is interested. For several reasons, this hypothesis calls for a revelation.

(1) A holy God, thus interested in the welfare and progress of His moral creatures would desire that they should know His will and should be regulated by principles in keeping with the demands of His holy character. He would also desire that they should know Him as one who cared for and sustained them. That is to say, He would desire some means of communication with them. The Christian's Bible fills exactly this function. In its moral and ethical ideals it furnishes a guide for human conscience. It reveals God in its presentation of Jesus Christ; and in its offer of reconciliation in the atonement, it presents a way by which man may come into fellowship with God.

(2) Again, if God is interested in His moral creatures, He will certainly desire to see them enjoying a condition of peace and happiness, and will furnish them with a knowledge of the means by which they may secure that end. The evident

facts of human life indicate that man is far from such an ideal status and badly in need of the means for securing it. Nothing could be more obvious than his native inability to live in harmony with the purest principles of conscience. However much one may be inclined to reject any formulated doctrine of depravity, he is faced on every side with the facts of the universal and invariable perversity of man's nature. His natural disposition, undisciplined and unrestrained, will lead him into the vilest conduct, and utter disregard of the interests and happiness of others. If he is the creation of a holy and merciful God, who desires the well-being of His creatures, then this dire corruption of his nature must be an occasion of deepest solicitude on the part of his Creator. And not only the fact of his sinful nature, but the host of tragedies consequent upon that sinful nature, would move God to solicitous concern. Heartache, dread, distrust, jealousy, hatred, oppression, poverty, disease, disappointment, crime and treachery are a few of the items in the train of death and disaster which follows in the wake of human sin. And there is not any possible way of explaining this horrible and heart-sickening situation of human life, independent of the inborn tendencies of man's nature. He makes just these conditions for himself. Does God care? The question contains its own answer. If we assume that there is a God, we must assume that He cares. Then may we not expect that He would

reveal the means and method by which the perversity of man's nature may be restrained and his condition in life thereby improved? Such is exactly the nature and result of the Christian's Bible. It proposes a method of redemption for human life, and the application of this method in Christian history has demonstrated its efficacy to secure the desired end.

(3) We have not thus far raised the question of immortality, but it is inevitably bound up with the proposition we are considering. It is not possible rationally to conceive of God creating a soul which He loves and then deliberately surrendering that soul to final and utter dissolution. The only way in which a theory of race immortality can meet this difficulty is upon the assumption that God loves His moral creation as a race, and not as individuals. Such a theory presents a very unsatisfactory and limited conception of God. The assumption of an individual interest in His creatures, on the part of God, involves a belief in the immortality of the individual soul. This immediately thrusts upon us the immense and staggering problem of an eternal future beyond the grave. In all his religious history, man has been desperately seeking some light upon that momentous question. If God loves him, He would not persistently deny him that light. Has God ever given him any answer to this great question? The Christian Bible exactly and adequately fills the demand. To those who accept its message of

hope it has never failed to give full and final satisfaction. It has set the hearts of untold millions peacefully at rest upon this question.

(4) We return, for our final argument, to the sphere of man's moral constitution. If God had purposed to give to man a revelation, he would have created within him an instinct which would respond to such a revelation when it came. The history of religion testifies to nothing more strongly than to the existence of such an instinct. The world has never known a highly developed religion which has not had a body of sacred literature which constituted the basis of its religious knowledge. This fact of history argues convincingly that man has a right to expect a revelation from God.

Thus we find that we have rational grounds for the proposition we have been considering, that man as the moral creation of a holy and loving God needs and may expect a revelation from Him, and the Christian's Bible adequately fills this demand.

a. The Bible has proven, from its very origin, a mighty factor in stirring within man the highest and noblest impulses of his soul. No one would dare to deny that the Christian religion, through the instrumentality of the Scriptures, has produced the purest and highest type of moral and religious character known to human history. In its emphasis upon moral rectitude and unselfish service, Christianity has far exceeded any other

religion, and this moral and spiritual emphasis has been derived directly from the Bible. Christianity presents a peculiarity all its own in this respect. Compare, if you please, Jesus of Nazareth with Mohammed, the founder of Islam. Has Brahmanism ever produced a Paul? Has Buddhism ever produced a John? Find, if you can, characters in any other religion comparable to Martin Luther, John Calvin, John Wesley, Charles Spurgeon, or Dwight L. Moody. The finished product of Christianity in human character and experience is absolutely without parallel. And yet, we are told by some critics that Christianity has no right to claim that its Scriptures compose a final and sufficient revelation from God; but that the literature of other religions deserves a place in the future life of the race. Upon what grounds, if you please?

The only reason in the world why we have any Bible is because it has proven from the first productive of religious experience. The entire world of Biblical scholarship is agreed that the most intensely religious people the world has ever seen were the Hebrews. And Gentile Christianity inherited from Judaism this religious intensity. Every book of the Bible, the moment it appeared, had to meet and satisfy this highly sensitive religious consciousness, a consciousness which craved and demanded a real and effective spiritual stimulus in the literature which was offered it. If this stimulus failed to be provided, the lit-

erary product was rejected from the group of sacred and authoritative writings. It was by exactly this process that we got our canon of Scripture. The religious consciousness of Judaism gave us the Old Testament canon. The religious consciousness of Christianity gave us the New Testament canon. No ecclesiastical authority or council of religious potentates gave us our Bible or rendered it authoritative.

Prof. E. F. Scott, of the Union Theological Seminary of New York, comments upon this fact thus: "It would clear away much confusion if we could clearly apprehend the fact that the New Testament owed its position from the first to its intrinsic excellence. . . . We cannot be sufficiently grateful that in the early centuries there was no official body of church leaders or theologians who could determine, by formal rules, which books should be included and which left out. . . . Out of the many miscellaneous writings which had come down from the earlier days a certain number were found, after a sifting that went on for some generations, to have selected themselves. They had proved, in Christian experience, to have an inner vitality, while others, which pretended to just as high a title, did not make the same appeal. . . . Men have treasured it (the New Testament) from the earliest days till now because it moves them, because it answers their needs and aspirations, because it truly pulses with a divine power" ("The New Testament of To-day," pp. 24-26).

These statements from a scholar of Professor Scott's standing and position, a representative of a liberal school of theological thought, are of more than ordinary significance. As may be seen by an examination of the context, these statements are not made as reluctant admissions, but as arguments to support a defence of the present day value of the New Testament.

The authoritative canon of Scripture was first of all received and framed by the religious consciousness of those to whom God gave it, and ecclesiastical councils simply yielded to the inevitable and adopted what was already in existence. The Old Testament canon was already crystallised in the religious consciousness of Judaism at least two centuries before the birth of Christ; the first formal action on the matter was taken by a council of rabbis at Jamnia, nearly a century after the birth of Christ (c. 90 A.D.). The New Testament canon was practically complete in Christian consciousness by 250 A.D. The first ecclesiastical council which we can be sure passed on the matter was at Carthage in 397 A.D. The books of our Bible were received as Scripture because, from the beginning, they functioned as Scripture. The Bible holds the place that it does to-day, not because of the action of ecclesiastical courts, but because of what it has wrought in the moral conscience and religious experience of the race.

b. My third proposition is this: This effect of

the Bible upon the moral and religious experience of men is the best proof we could offer that it is really a revelation from God. If we acknowledge that there is a God, a God of tender paternal interest in His moral creation, then nothing is more certain than that he should seek to reveal Himself to His people. We have seen that the fact of God's existence creates the necessity for a revelation. We have seen that the Bible performs the necessary function of such a revelation, then why not accept it as such? This wonderful Book has come down through the ages, challenging man's conscience with the nobility of its moral ideals; lifting his soul to the heights of rapture with the glory of its redemptive hope; drying his falling tears and healing his broken heart with the gentle whisperings of its grace and love; moving him out in loving service to others with the beauty of its ideals of sacrifice; and beckoning him upward toward God and eternal life with its crowning offer of divine companionship. Surely, if God is to reveal Himself to man, it must be in just such a book as the Bible. It has stood every test and met every demand, and so to it we may confidently cling as the final and true revelation from God.



